

REMARKS

Examiner M. Masinick is thanked for the thorough examination and search of the subject Patent Application. Claims 1-20 have been canceled. New Claims 21-32 have been added.

All Claims are believed to be in condition for Allowance, and that is so requested.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention without undue experimentation is requested based on Canceled Claims 1-20, New Claims 21-32, and on the following remarks.

Applicant has canceled Claims 1-20 and has presented New Claims 21-32. New Claims 21-32 are drawn to Applicant's invention as described in the Specification and in the Drawing. In particular, New Claim 21 reads:

21. (New) A computer system for supervision and operation of a semiconductor facility, said system comprising:
a plurality of processing tools;

TS-00-096

a manufacturing execution system to control said
5 processing tools and to track manufacturing data;
a plurality of user set-up functions to selectively
transfer user data from a plurality of users to said
manufacturing execution system and to selectively transfer
said manufacturing data from said manufacturing execution
10 system to said users; and
a user interface function to translate said
manufacturing data prior to said transfer to said users and
to translate said user data from said users prior to said
transfer to said manufacturing execution system.

Each of the elements of Claim 21 is shown in Fig. 1 and is
further described in the Specification on pages 7-9. Further,
the Specification does describe the claimed invention, as cited
in Claim 21, with sufficient detail for one skilled in the art
to practice the invention. One skilled in the art of computer
control of a manufacturing facility could configure that control
system as described in Claim 21 without undue experimentation.
Finally, Claims 22-26 describe specific and patentably distinct
further limitations on Claim 21 that are described in the
specification. New Claims 21-26 should meet the requirements
under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

New Claim 27 describes a method of controlling semiconductor manufacture. Claim 27 reads:

27. (New) A method of supervision and operation of a semiconductor facility, said method comprising: providing a plurality of processing tools; providing a computer system comprising:

5 a manufacturing execution system to control said processing tools and to track manufacturing data;

 a plurality of user set-up functions to selectively transfer user data from a plurality of users to said manufacturing execution system and to

10 selectively transfer said manufacturing data from said manufacturing execution system to said users; and

 a user interface function to translate said manufacturing data prior to said transfer to said users and to translate said user data from said users

15 prior to said transfer to said manufacturing execution system; and

 monitoring said processing tool through said computer system.

Claim 27 combines the functional elements of the Drawing with their described function as shown in the specification. Each of

TS-00-096

the elements of Claim 27 is shown in Fig. 1 and is further described in the Specification on pages 7-9. Further, the Specification does describe the claimed invention, as cited in Claim 27, with sufficient detail for one skilled in the art to practice the invention. One skilled in the art of computer control of a manufacturing facility can configure that control method as described in Claim 27 without undue experimentation. Finally, Claims 28-32 describe specific and patentably distinct further limitations on Claim 27 that are described in the specification. New Claims 27-32 should meet the requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to make or use the invention without undue experimentation is requested based on Canceled Claims 1-20, New Claims 21-32, and on the above remarks.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is requested based on Canceled Claims 1-20, New Claims 21-32, and on the following remarks.

TS-00-096

Applicant has canceled Claims 1-20 and has present New Claims 21-32. As shown above, New Claims 21-32 do not contain the indefinite phrases "such as" or "typically and preferably". Further, other indefinite, wordy, and confusing language is not used in the new claims. New Claims 21-32 should meet the requirements under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Reconsideration of Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is requested based on Canceled Claims 1-20, New Claims 21-32, and on the above remarks.

Applicants have reviewed the prior art made of record and not relied upon and have discussed their impact on the present invention above.

Allowance of all Claims is requested.

It is requested that should Examiner M. Masinick not find that the Claims are now Allowable that the Examiner call the undersigned at 989-894-4392 to overcome any problems preventing allowance.

TS-00-096

Respectfully submitted,

Douglas R Schnabel

Douglas R. Schnabel, Reg. No. 47,927